



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

 REGION 5
 77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD
 CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

 FERNALD
 LOG K-2395

SEP 9 8 15 AM '97

FILE 5472.46

REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF:

SEP 05 1997

(AE-17J)

CERTIFIED MAIL
RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

Jack R. Craig, Fernald Remedial Action Project Manager
 Fernald Environmental Management Project
 United States Department of Energy
 Fernald Field Office (FN)
 Post Office Box 538705, Mail Stop 45
 Cincinnati, Ohio 45253-8705

Dear Mr. Craig:

Enclosed is the United States Environmental Protection Agency's (USEPA) draft report concerning the July 21 through 25, 1997, inspection of the United States Department of Energy (USDOE) Fernald Environmental Management Project for compliance with the 40 C.F.R. 61, Subpart H, *National Emission Standards for Emission of Radionuclides Other Than Radon from Department of Energy Facilities (Subpart H NESHAP)*.

Please review the document for the factual information contained within the report and provide any factual correction or other comments to be addressed in the final inspection report. Copies of this draft report and the final report with any corrections and/or comments that need to be addressed will be forwarded to the appropriate contacts within the State of Ohio, USEPA, USDOE, and the Site Contractors for USDOE.

Please contact me at (312) 353-6686 for further clarification or additional questions pertaining to the findings for this inspection.

Sincerely yours,

Michael H. Murphy, Health Physicist
 Air and Radiation Division

Enclosure

978
 6-601

- 2 -

cc w/enclosure:

Ed Skintik
USDOE-FEMP

Kathy Nickel
USDOE-FEMP

Kip Klee
FDF

Lewis Goidell
FDF

Mark Cherry
FDF

Jim Colelli
ODH/BRP

Dana Thompson
Ohio EPA

William Lohner
Ohio EPA-OFFO

Tom Tucker
Ohio EPA

Charles Phillips
SC&A

- 3 -

standard bcc's: official file copy w/attachment(s)
 originator's file copy w/attachment(s)
 originating organization reading file w/attachment(s)
 Branch reading file w/attachment(s)
 Division reading file w/attachment(s)

other bcc's: J. Barnette via WPO
 G. Jablonowski via WPO
 J. Saric via WPO
 B. Barwick via WPO
 J. Rosenberg USEPA HQ via WPO

ARD:ATRB:RS:MMURPHY:mm:08/29/97

DISKETTE/FILE: C:\EPAWORK\INSPECTI\FEMP\BASELINE\FINDING1.WPD



UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY

REGION 5
77 WEST JACKSON BOULEVARD
CHICAGO, IL 60604-3590

REPLY TO THE ATTENTION OF:

Inspection Under the National Emission Standards for
Emissions of Radionuclides Other Than Radon
From Department of Energy Facilities
40 CFR 61, Subpart H

I. FACILITY IDENTIFICATION

A. Facility Location

Fernald Environmental Management Project
7400 Willey Road
Fernald, Ohio 45030 (Site Location)

Fernald Environmental Management Project
United States Department of Energy
Fernald Field Office (FN)
Post Office Box 538705, Mail Stop 45
Cincinnati, Ohio 45253-8705 (Mailing Address)

B. Responsible Official

Jack R. Craig, Director
United States Department of Energy
Ohio Field Office, Fernald Area Office

II. DATE OF INSPECTION

July 21 through 25, 1997

III. PARTICIPANTS

A. Facility

Kathleen Nickel, USDOE; Ed Skintik, USDOE; Mark Cherry, FDF; Kevin Tschaen, FDF; Kip Klee, FDF; Phil Spots, FDF; Debbie Reichard, FDF; Tim

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

- 2 -

Miller, FDF, Sue Olensky, FDF; John Byrne, FDF; Larry Tomzack, FDF; Lewis C. Goidell, FDF

B. USEPA

Michael H. Murphy, Lead Inspector, USEPA; Jeanette Marrero, USEPA; Charles Phillips, SC&A, Contractor for USEPA

C. State of Ohio

James Colelli, ODH/BRP; William Lohner, OEPA/OFFO; Peter Sturdevant, Hamilton County Department of Environmental Services; Dana Thompson, OEPA/CDO

IV. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

AMS	Air Monitoring Station
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
APC	Air Pollution Control
BE	Building exhaust
BRP	Bureau of Radiation Protection
C	Celsius
CDO	Central District Office
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Restoration, Compensation, and Liabilities Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
cpm	Counts per minute
DAPC	Dayton Air Pollution Control or Division of Air Pollution Control
DMR	Discharge Monitoring Report

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

DOE	Department of Energy (United States)
DQO	Data Quality Objective
EDE	Effective Dose Equivalent
EML	Environmental Measurements Laboratory
EMSL-LV	Environmental Monitoring Systems Laboratory at Las Vegas
F	Fahrenheit
FDF	Flour Daniel Fernald
FEMP	Fernald Environmental Management Project
FFA	Federal Facility Agreement
FFCA	Federal Facility Compliance Agreement
FMPC	Feed Materials Production Center
FOV	Finding of Violation
g	Grams
Ge(Li)	Germanium Lithium detection probe
KeV	Kilo electron volts (1000 electron volts)
μm	Micrometer, Micron (0.000001 meter)
MDL	Minimum detection Limit
N/A	Not Applicable or Not Available
NAREL	National Air and Radiation Environmental Laboratory
NESHAP	National Emission Standard for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NOAA	National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

ODH	Ohio Department of Health
OEPA	Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
OFFO	Office of Federal Facility Oversight
QA	Quality Assurance
QAPjP	Quality Assurance Project Plan
QC	Quality Control
RMP	Radon Measurement Program
SC&A	Sanford Cohen and Associates
SOPs	Standard Operating Procedures
SOW	Scope of Work
U-235	Uranium-235
USDOE	United States Department of Energy
USEPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency

V. OBJECTIVE/SCOPE OF INSPECTION

The objective of this inspection is to provide a baseline evaluation by the USEPA for compliance with the radionuclide NESHAP, 40 CFR 61, Subpart H. The inspection is intended to ascertain whether the Fernald Environmental Management Project is meeting the requirement of the rule and conditions are as represented in the latest annual report. An evaluation of the current status of the FFA on 40 CFR 61, Subpart Q will also be assessed to verify any changes that may be necessary to better reflect the actual site conditions at this time. The Findings of this inspection will determine the necessity of issuing Findings of Violations (FOVs) and negotiating a Federal Facility Compliance Agreement (FFCA). This inspection will cover as many areas as possible and in as great a detail and depth as possible in the given time for the baseline inspection.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

The scope of the inspection is to 1) perform a walk-through survey to observe all of the locations that are, have been, or are currently suspected of being emission points on site to determine compliance with the monitoring requirements of the regulation, 2) review the proposed sites for an alternate air monitoring program that has been requested for approval, and 3) examine documents on dose modeling and compliance with other record keeping requirements of the rule.

VI. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The following description is taken from the 1996 National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants, Subpart H Annual Report dated June 24, 1997.

The Fernald Environmental Management Project (FEMP) is located on a 425 hectare (1050 acre) area approximately 27 km (17 miles) northwest of Cincinnati, Ohio. The Production area covers approximately 136 acres (55 hectares) in the center of the FEMP. The facility is sited just north of the small farming community of Fernald, Ohio.

The area immediately surrounding the FEMP is primarily rural in nature, characterized by the predominance of agriculture, with some light industry and private residences. The FEMP is located on a relatively level plain, outside of the 500-year flood plain of the Great Miami River, in an ancestral river valley known as the New Haven Trough.

The climate is characterized as continental, with average temperatures ranging from approximately 29° F (-1.7° C) in January, to 76° F (24.4° C) in July. Average annual precipitation is approximately 40 inches (102 cm) per year. Prevailing wind flow is from the south-southwest.

For 37 years, the former Feed Materials Production Center (Fernald Site) produced uranium metals for the United States Department of Energy (DOE) and its predecessors. On July 10, 199, uranium metals production was suspended. Management responsibilities of the Fernald site were transferred from the Defense Programs organization to DOE's Office of Environmental Restoration and Waste Management.

Currently, most activities at the FEMP are conducted under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liabilities Act (CERCLA). These activities include sample analysis, waste characterization, the management, treatment, storage, and disposal of hazardous, mixed, low-level and solid

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

wastes, and the decontamination and cleanup of radioactively contaminated buildings, equipment, soils, and waters. The site also manages thorium wastes, and K-65 silo waste material which contains radium and produces radon gas.

VII.**INSPECTION FINDINGS**

The following findings were observed actions, documentations, or lacks of actions and/or documentations during the baseline inspection of the FEMP conducted July 21 through 25, 1997. These observations were provided by USEPA, SC&A, contractor to USEPA, ODH/BRP, and various OEPA offices. Each of these findings need to be addressed. Some of these items were mentioned during the close out meeting and it was indicated that these issues would be addressed in an expedited time frame.

GENERAL FINDINGS

- 1) While the real-time data collection from the radon monitors is impressive, FEMP is not making adequate efforts to measure the impacts to the public from 5 fold increases in silo headspace concentrations. Instrument background should be subtracted from gross counts when measuring radon concentrations, as well as, tracking meteorological data with radon concentrations to indicate when certain sampling location are being affected from releases from the silos. Efforts should be directed at measuring net radon concentrations as low as possible at the FEMP fence line.
- 2) The routine uranium and thorium analyses for the stack and environmental particulate samples are performed at the FEMP at internally managed laboratories while the quarterly, more extensive analyses, are performed at commercial laboratories under contract to Fluor Daniel. The contract laboratories were selected through a competitive process and perform according to the statement of work (SOW) in their contract.
- 3) Data and supporting documentation from both the internal and contract laboratories was reviewed. The data review was intended to provide an assessment of the quality and sufficiency of the analysis performed on NESHAPS compliance samples. In addition, since FEMP has requested to use ambient monitoring data in lieu of stack sampling, the ambient monitoring data currently being generated were included.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

Three questions were addressed:

- Are the laboratories conforming to written SOPs, procedures, and plans?
- Can the data be independently verified (reproduced) from the documents accompanying that data or conveniently and in a comprehensive package?
- Was the analytical process in control, as evidenced by the results of quality control samples analyzed concurrently with the samples?

4) The requirements of the SOW associated with the procurement of contract laboratory services is consistent with procurements for DOE programs. If the contract laboratories selected conform to these requirements, the data packages submitted by these laboratories can be used to answer the last two and a portion of the first of the above questions. A review of two comprehensive data packages prepared by one of the contract laboratories indicated that, in general, that laboratory was compliant with the contract requirements relative to the contents of the data packages. However, there was no evidence to indicate that the data packages received by Flour Daniel from the contract laboratory were subjected to a verification process to confirm contract compliance.

5) A review of the training records of the primary analysts for uranium and thorium, indicated that their training and certifications were compliant with the requirements of the Quality Assurance Plan.

6) The laboratory Quality Assurance Plan, which I cursorily reviewed, lacked the degree of specificity usually found in such documents. For example, the frequency of QC samples is not specified in the Plan.

7) Laboratory instrument calibrations appear to have been performed adequately and timely. Standard preparations are well documented and traceable.

8) A review of the results of the internal QC samples and the external PE (performance evaluation) samples indicates that the laboratory is performing well.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

9) After the accumulation of documentation from several sources, I was able to independently verify some data from the stack sampling analyses. However, some of the requested data could not be produced within the time frame of the audit.

10) Thorium work cards often had no "sign-off" on data entry or review and one uranium work card had no signed approval.

11) The corrective action file seemed complete and the actions documented. However, the follow-up to situations creating the necessity of a corrective action was lacking. Most corrective actions tried to explain away the necessity of any action as opposed to looking into the reason for a failure.

12) Internal audits were performed and documented.

SPECIFIC FINDINGS

1) While observing a high volume air sample filter change out at AMS#5 the technician did not use gloves to change out the filter nor to replace the filter. While the procedures do not specifically mention donning gloves, it is good sampling protocol to wear gloves to exchange filters. One pair should be worn to remove the soiled filter, and a clean pair should be used to place the new filter. This practice should help prevent cross contamination of filters.

2) A number of the proposed ambient air monitoring locations will require trees and brush to be removed from the proposed site before monitoring begins. (Specifically AMS#22).

3) The height of the alpha track-etch cups should be consistent. The height of these samplers should be 1.7 - 2 meters. If comparisons are made between the continuous samplers and alpha track-etch cups, then these two samplers should be at the same height.

4) The calibration stickers for the air flow monitors on the laboratory stack were out of date.

5) The High Volume Air Monitoring Procedure (PROC. NO. SRS-REM-001) appears to be out of date. The documentation employed by the field sampling technician did not match the documentation requirements listed in this procedure.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

6) The Real-Time Environmental Monitoring Procedure EM-RM-014 is out of date. This procedure is dated 6/16/92. FEMP procedures are required to be reviewed every two years. (If this procedure has been reviewed, there was no documentation provided to indicate a review date.)

7) There is little documentation provided with the alpha track-etch radon monitors to indicate data manipulation from vendor to concentrations reported in the ASER.

8) OEPA concurs with the finding that the current recordkeeping methods appear to be insufficient to allow independent verification of the analytical process. Also, records should be available, *on-site*, as required under 40 CFR 61.95.

9) The Environmental Radon Monitoring procedure (PROC NO: EP-REM-011) is not consistent with actual field sampling practices. The procedure indicates the use of type "L" and type "M" cups while "radon only" cups are being used. Also, blind blank (unexposed) cups should be sent to the vendor as a QC on the measuring laboratory.

10) The RMP listing for radon vendor appeared to be out-of-date.

11) The desiccant tower and filter of the silos continuous radon monitoring system need to be changed with an appropriate frequency and documented in a procedure. (As observed, the desiccant tower required changing.)

12) The USEPA Region 5 requires a 95 percent recovery rate for all meteorological data used for compliance. The meteorological tower equipment needs to be in sufficient replicate to assure that this is met. Typically three separate sets of equipment for each of the sampling points on the tower is considered adequate. One set currently installed, one set that may be out for calibrations, and a third set as an emergency backup for unforeseen circumstances that can readily occur during the time of thunderstorms or other adverse weather conditions.

13) The Advanced Waste Water Treatment (AWWT) facility has been identified as a source of radionuclide emissions. However, no mention of the AWWT is made in the annual report for 1996. The status of the AWWT, therefore, remains unclear.

14) An application for the renewal of the State Permit to Operate (PTO) has been submitted to this Department for the Laundry Facilities located in Building

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

11. This application contains a request that the requirement for monitoring of the stack be deleted. Although the calculated Potential to Emit (PTE) does not require monitoring of this source under 40 CFR 61.93, the stack monitoring requirements of the PTO remain in effect until a determination to the contrary is made.

14) The Fernald facility has submitted an application to USEPA for approval to use environmental measurements an alternate compliance method. Since the point of compliance under Subpart H is at the receptor locations, the placement of monitoring stations is of prime importance. It is questionable whether monitoring locations at the FEMP property fence line combined with selected groupings of off-property monitors will provide an accurate representation of potential receptors.

15) The single finding from my portion of the audit relates to the lack of comprehensive documentation upon which to independently verify the analytical data produced by the internal laboratory for stack analyses. No data package, as such, exists which documents the analytical analysis process and the QC samples appropriate to it. While the data seem to be available in several different locations it is never assembled into a single package. Thus, much effort it required for an auditor to evaluate the analytical results. I have outlined below what I think is a minimum data package that should be produced.

Sample Cross Reference:

It was difficult to track samples due to various numbers assigned. A table providing this at the beginning would help.

Case Narrative:

No case narrative is currently developed to cover both the uranium and thorium analyses. So it is not possible to determine if problems were encountered during the analyses.

Sample Data Report:

The results of all analysis for a single sample should be on one sheet.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

QC Summary:

The results of all QC samples processed should be summarized.

Standards and Calibration:

Standards and tracers should be identified along with the documentation of dilutions and copies of certificates. Instrumentation calibrations should be documented.

Sample Preparation Summary:

Sample preparation logs; including weights, dilutions, and sample analysis fractions; should be presented.

Raw Data:

Enough raw analysis data should be included to verify the results

16) It does not appear that the analytical data documentation developed for NESHAPS compliance samples currently meets the record keeping requirements of the rule.

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT